

Categorical Exclusion Documentation Format for Actions Other Than Hazardous Fuels and Fire Rehabilitation Actions

Right-Of-Way (ROW) AZA-036030
DOI-BLM-AZ-P010-2012-031- CX

A. Background

BLM Office: Hassayampa Field Office (HFO)
Lease/Serial/Case File No.: AZAR-020964/AZA-036030
Proposed Action Title/Type: ROW/12kV Powerline
Applicant: Arizona Public Service
Sub-project Number: LVRRAA912AI33
Location of Proposed Action:

T. 14 N., R. 2 W., G&SR Meridian, Yavapai County, Arizona
Section 10, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$

USGS Prescott 1972 7.5 Minute Series Quadrangle, Topographic Map, Arizona - Yavapai County.
The subject land is located approximately four and one-half miles north of Prescott and one mile west of Willow Creek Reservoir.

Description of Proposed Action:

The right-of-way grant for this 69kV distribution line was originally issued on August 29, 1960. The line, known as the "Chino Valley 69 kV Tie Line", is 1160 feet in length by 20 feet and connects the powerline with a substation which provides power to the town of Chino Valley; a small town located approximately 14 miles north of Prescott. Arizona Public Service has requested that the right-of-way be reauthorized under FLPMA and a new right-of-way grant issued. The powerline is located within an existing right-of-way and its reauthorization will require no new facilities, new construction, or any new ground disturbance.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: Bradshaw Harquahala Resource Management Plan
Date Approved/Amended: 4/22/2010

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Land Use Authorization LR-24, "Continue to issue land use authorizations (right-of-way, leases, permits, easements) on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with resource management prescriptions in this land use plan."

C: Compliance with NEPA

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with BLM NEPA Handbook H-1790-1, Appendix 4 or 516 Departmental Manual (DM) 11.9:

Categorical Exclusions E. Realty (11), “Conversion of existing right-of-way grants to Title V grants or existing leases to FLPMA Section 302(b) leases where no new facilities or other changes are needed”.

A categorical exclusion (CX) is appropriate as there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in H-1790-1, Appendix 5 or 516 DM 2, Appendix 2 apply.

[NOTE: Appropriate staff should determine exception, comment, and initial for concurrence. If exceptions apply to the action or project, and existing NEPA documentation does not address it (i.e., Part III) then further NEPA analysis is required. Attachment 1 (BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances), enclosed, is a checklist of each extraordinary circumstance and corresponding staff concurrence].

D. Signature

Review: *We have determined that the proposal is in accordance with CX criteria and that it would not involve any significant environmental effects (see Attachment 1). Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review.*

Prepared by: _____/S/_____
Michael Rice
Project Manager, APS Team

Reviewed by: _____/S/_____
Leah Baker
Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Approved by: _____/S/_____
D. Remington Hawes
Field Manager, Hassayampa Field Office

E. Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact: Michael Rice, Project Manager APS Team, by phone 623-580-5646, e-mail mrice@blm.gov, or the BLM Phoenix District Office address at 21605 N. 7th Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85027.

Note: A separate decision document must be prepared for the action covered by the CX.

F. Recommendation

Project Description: The applicant has applied for a right-of-way seeking authorization for the continued use of an existing powerline ROW (AZAR-020964). The 69kV powerline provides power to the Chino Valley area and if approved, the new grant would be issued for a term of 30 years, expiring in 2039.

Determination: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendation in Attachment 1 (BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances), I have determined the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. I concur with the proposed action provided the right-of-way includes all of the relevant stipulations contained in the original grant as well as those that are now being included in new right-of-way grants.

Approved by: _____/S/_____
D. Remington Hawes
Hassayampa Field Manager

Date: __08/30/2012__

BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances¹
Attachment 1

CRITERIA	<u>Comment (Y/N)</u>	<u>Staff Initial</u>
1. Have significant impacts on public health and safety?	<u>NO</u>	<u>MR</u>
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas?	<u>NO</u>	<u>MR</u>
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?	<u>NO</u>	<u>MR</u>
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?	<u>NO</u>	<u>MR</u>
5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?	<u>NO</u>	<u>MR</u>
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?	<u>NO</u>	<u>MR</u>
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau or office?	<u>NO</u>	<u>MR</u>
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?	<u>NO</u>	<u>MR</u>
9. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners, or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?	<u>NO</u>	<u>MR</u>
10. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?	<u>NO</u>	<u>MR</u>

- | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| 11. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)? | <u>NO</u> | <u>MR</u> |
| 12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)? | <u>NO</u> | <u>MR</u> |

¹ If an action has any of these impacts, you must conduct NEPA analysis.